Forest Products Solicitation Q & A

Question 1. I would like to apply for the forest products gasification, fiber extraction enhancements and emissions being diminished. We are in the laboratory to pilot scale stage and have proven correctly so far the black liquor process is cumbersome, environmentally dangerous and expensive compared to our non-toxic extraction process. The gasification would be a component and is commercially viable.

We'd like to work together (the University of Iowa, Iowa State and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory) to commercialize the technologies initially with crop residues and forest products produced in Northern Minnesota by Boise-Cascade, Potlatch-soon to be purchased by Sorenson and the Blandin -UPM group is developing a huge wood burning electrical energy site that we could assist in upgrading performance by diminishing waste, emissions and retaining the lignins and hemicellulose for fuel the cellulose would be recovered and higher in quality then black liquor processed material for paper and other applications. Would this fall within the scope of this forest products solicitation.

Answer 1. This would not fall within the scope of this solicitation

Question 2. My question is to determine the funding availability for processing via pyrolysis the creosol contaminated railroad ties for reuse as an alternative to conventional petroleum diesel for locomotive fuels. Same team as in question 1, and the sponsor would be a railroad maintenance firm co-sponsoring Union Pacific and Burlington Northern Railroad and obviously others as soon as the opportunity to recycle the ties became an acceptable procedure.

Answer 2. This would not fall within the scope of this solicitation

Question 3. I noticed you've released your new AF&PA solicitation. It appears in the summary and in the body of the solicitation that the scope is limited to thermal gasification ("gasification, fiber modification, VOC and HAP). Of course, the Anaerobic Pump would impact all of those categories. Is anaerobic gasification not included in "research priorities in higher value through sustainable forestry"?

Answer 3. That would not fall within the scope of " research priorities in higher value through sustainable forestry."

Question 4. Does the Anaerobic Pump qualify for this solicitation?

Answer 4. This project does not explicitly fall within the scope of the gasification and VOC/HAP portions of the solicitation, but it provides for an interesting technological concept to offer crosscutting benefits to the industry. We recommend that it be submitted to future solicitation where there is a better fit with the scope of the technology being requested.

Question 5. Why would DOE/OIT would limit this solicitation to Gasification only? Pyrolysis is a pretty inefficient technology that has a large limitation at 50% water. All of the pulp and paper sludges are greater than 50% water.

Answer 5. This solicitation does not address only gasification, the solicitation was written to solicit proposals that produce integrated projects with larger impacts for more

substantial industry improvements. Emphasis was placed on looking across traditional technology lines toward innovative, integrated, crosscutting solutions.

Question 6. Question regarding the subject solicitation: I note on page 5 the sentence, "No fee or profit will be paid to cooperative agreement award recipients." What about overhead to industrial/commercial (paid) subrecipients (not participants providing cost share, but actual subcontractors)? Some will have received overhead that was allowed by DCAA on past assistance cooperative agreements, some may never have worked on a Federal project before.

Answer 6. No increment above cost may be paid to a recipient or subrecipient under a DOE award or subaward, except for SBIR recipients as provided in 10 CFR 600.181(d)(3). A fee or profit may be paid to a contractor providing goods or services under a contract with a recipient or subrecipient. - 10 CFR 600.127(c).

Question 7. On the AF & PA Solicitations, I gather from the descriptions of eligible applicants that an "institution of higher learning" such as MSU would apply to DE-PS07-02ID14271 and not FP2003, which is a similar solicitation. Can you tell me if this is a correct assumption?

Answer 7. That is correct; FP2003 is for National Laboratories only.

Question 8. We currently have patent applications filed for the base technologies we will be developing further with funding from this program. If additional patentable technology is developed with this funding, will the principal investigator be allowed to retain ownership and patent rights?

Answer 8. Clause 48 CFR 952.227-11, Patent Rights - Retention by Contractor, will be incorporated into awards with domestic small business firms or nonprofit organizations. These applicants can elect to take title to subject inventions produced under the award. Subject inventions are inventions which are conceived or first actually reduced to practice under the award. The government will have a paid-up nonexclusive license any patents which issue on subject inventions.

Clause 48 CFR 952.227-13, Patent Rights - Acquisition by the Government, will be incorporated into awards with large business firms or other organizations. Title in any subject inventions produced under the award will vest in the government. However, in accordance with 48 CFR 952.227-84, applicants have a right to request in advance of, or within 30 days after the award is signed, a waiver of all or any part of the rights of the United States with respect to subject inventions. Once a patent waiver is granted, applicants have similar rights as above under 48 CFR 952.227-11.

Note: You should review the section titled, "APPLICATION" in the solicitation to make the determination if these instructions would impact your proposal.

Question 9. Must the results be published?

Answer 9. Yes.

Question 10. If we are successful in receiving a grant, is there any mandatory requirements for splitting the funds with joint participants. (Or are we able to make our own deals).

Answerer 10. There are no mandatory requirements.

Question 11. I assume the principal investigator is the recipient.

Answer 11. The agreements are generally between the government and the organization that employs the principal investigator.